REMARKS

In the Office Action of 1/24/06, the Examiner restricted claims 20-24, rejected claims 1-6, 8-10, 14, 16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,150,279, hereinafter Collins) in view of Nagase (U.S. Patent No. 6,007,358, hereinafter Nagase), and rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view of Nagase, and further in view of Sickles (U.S. Patent No. 4,600,231, hereinafter Sickles). Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner indicated that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this Amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 17 and 20-24 and added new claim 25. Accordingly, claims 1-10, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 25 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Restriction of Claims 20-24

In the Office Action, claims 20-24 were restricted. Applicants hereby elect with traverse and request reconsideration of the restriction of claim 20. Under MPEP 803, an application may properly be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if they are able to support separate patents and they are either independent (MPEP § 806.04 -§ 806.04(i)) or distinct (MPEP § 806.05 -§ 806.05(i)). Claim 20 is dependent on claim 1 and further define how the computer boards are attached to the railings in claim 1. Therefore, claim 20 is not independent from claim 1.

Thus claim 20 must be found to be distinct from claim 1 to be properly restricted. Under MPEP 806.05(c), to establish that combination (claim 1) and subcombination (claim 20) inventions are distinct, it must be shown that the combination (claim 1) as claimed:

> (A) does not require the particulars of the sub-combination (claim 20) as claimed for patentability (to show novelty and unobviousness), and
>
> (B) the subcombination (claim 20) can be shown to have utility either by itself or in other and different relations.

MPEP 806.05(c) further states that when these factors cannot be shown, such inventions are not distinct. In the Office Action of 1/24/06, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view of Nagase. Although Applicants traverse this rejection (as discussed below), the Examiner did not hold that the combination (claim 1) does not require the particulars of the sub-combination (claim 20) for patentability (as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner rejected claim 1). As such, claim 20 can not be properly restricted from claim 1 as a distinct invention under MPEP 806.05(c). Further, MPEP 806.05(b) states that restriction is ordinarily not proper between a combination (AB) that the Examiner holds to be unpatentable and a subcombination (B) in which the Examiner holds the novelty, if any, to reside.

As such, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement regarding claim 20.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-10, 14, 16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view of Nagase. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Claim 1 recites an assembly for housing a computer system, wherein the assembly comprises:

> a) a housing comprising a plurality of railings;
> b) a plurality of computer circuit boards attached to the railings, wherein the circuit boards are integrated to form the computer system; and,
> c) a power supply coupled to the railings for supplying power to the circuit boards.

Applicants submit that neither Collins nor Nagase, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or even suggest each recited feature of claim 1. For example, neither Collins nor Nagase disclose, teach, or even suggest a plurality of computer circuit boards attached to the railings and a power supply coupled to the railings for supplying power to the circuit boards.

Collins discloses a computer system package having switches on platters and memory modules coupled between the platters at the core of the package and processor modules about the periphery of the core (see Abstract). In Collins, power busses are run up the center of the core and are utilized as part of the structure to mount and power the switch/memory sandwiches (col. 8, lines 7-10). As known in the art, memory modules are not equivalent to circuit boards. As such, Collins does not teach or suggest a power supply coupled to the railings (platters) for supplying power to circuit boards (as required in claim 1), since in Collins, power busses running up the center of the core are utilized to power only the switch/memory sandwiches. As disclosed in Collins, a power supply is applied individually to processor modules via power tabs for providing power to each processor module. The ability to power each processor separately from powering the central memory core is cited as an advantage in Collins. *See* column 6, lines 4-20 of Collins. Therefore, Collins does not teach or suggest a power supply coupled to the railings (platters) for supplying power to circuit boards, as required in claim 1.

Nagase discloses a connecting structure of an electrical supply bus, by which a power supply module or a logic package is mounted in a case for an electronic device, the connecting structure consisting of guide rails provided with a plurality of wedge-like spaces (see Abstract). However, no where in Nagase is it taught or suggested that a single power supply is coupled to railings for supplying power to a plurality of circuit boards, as required in claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite the precise portions of Nagase that disclose these limitations. As such, Nagase does not cure the deficiencies of Collins.

In addition, there is no motive to combine Nagase and Collins. The motivation to combine the references must be come from the references themselves and not from the present application. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to supply power to the

railings of Collins, as taught by Nagase, since the device of Nagase would provide power buses from the internal core area to the rails of Collins, thereby eliminating the need to attach power modules to the outer surface of the circuit boards of Collins and thus provide a smaller footprint for the assembly of Collins. However, as stated above, the ability to power each processor separately from powering the central memory core is cited as an advantage in Collins. Therefore, Collins teaches against providing a power supply to the railings (platters) for supplying power to circuit boards and thus does not provide a motive to combine with the teachings of Nagase.

As such, Applicants believe claim 1 is in allowable form. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 14, 16, 18, and 19 are dependent upon claim 1 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view of Nagase, and further in view of Sickles. Claim 7 is dependent upon claim 1 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

III. Allowed Claim 17 and New Claim 25

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner indicated that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have added new claim 25 which is an independent claim that includes the limitations of claim 17 and all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, Applicants believe claim 25 is in allowable form.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the rejections in the Office Action of 1/24/06 are fully overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 3/22/06

Gregory Suh
Reg. No. 48,187

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
PO Box 51860
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.104
Fax: (650) 752-0995